



San Antonio River, NPS photo

# Environmental Consequences

This chapter of the *Environmental Assessment* describes the potential environmental and socioeconomic consequences (also called impacts or effects) of implementing the two alternatives considered in the *Draft Fort Hunter Liggett Special Resource Study*.

## Methodology for Analyzing Consequences

Consequences are determined by comparing future conditions under the various alternatives with the existing baseline conditions. The analysis includes consideration of the context, intensity, duration, and cumulative effects of the alternatives. The National Park Service based this analysis and conclusions on a review of existing literature, information provided by experts within the NPS and other organizations; analysis of case studies of existing programs in other locations, and the professional judgment of the study team members. The following definitions, standards, and guidelines will be used in describing consequences:

**Context:** Impacts are considered at their local, regional, or national context as appropriate.

### Intensity:

Negligible – Impact is at the lower level of detection; no discernible effect

Minor – Impact is slight, but detectable; impacts present, but not expected to have an overall effect

Moderate – Impact is readily apparent; clearly detectable and could have appreciable effect

Major – Impact is severely adverse or exceptionally beneficial; substantial, highly noticeable influence

### Duration:

Short term – Impact is temporary or transitional.

Long term – Impact is permanent.

### Incidence:

Direct – Impact occurs at the same time and in the same place as the action.

Indirect – Impact occurs later or at some distance from the action.

**Cumulative Impacts:** These impacts on the environment result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (regardless of what agency, whether federal or non-federal, or person undertakes such other actions). They can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

## Summary of Alternatives

**Alternative A: No Action.** Under Alternative A, the Army would retain the excess property in interim use status for an indefinite period, during which minimal or no maintenance activities would be conducted. No change in use is expected for any of the excess property during this interim period. The Milpitas Hacienda would be operated by a concessioner for lodging and food service. The Army and California State Parks (CSP) have negotiated an interim lease for the Milpitas Hacienda to provide for ongoing management until longer-term disposal or transfer is implemented. The ranch bungalows would be used for housing, storage, and other non-public uses. The Gil Adobe and the Tidball Store would continue to be unused. The Army would continue to manage the remainder of the Fort Hunter Liggett installation. The National Park Service would have no involvement in the ownership or management of any Fort Hunter Liggett structures or properties. At some future time, it is assumed that the Army would pursue one of the options outlined in the *Army Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett* or would take other action, at their discretion.

**Alternative B: Addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and Designation as an Affiliated Area of the National Park System.** Under this alternative, legislation would authorize direct transfer of the Milpitas Hacienda complex

and the ranch bungalows to California State Parks to be managed as an addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument (Hearst Castle®) and as an affiliated area of the national park system. A separate study would be prepared by the NPS to consider the addition of the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows to the Hearst San Simeon Estate National Historic Landmark (NHL).

The Gil Adobe and the Tidball Store are listed on the National Register of Historic Places at the local level of significance. Legislation would authorize direct transfer of these sites to California State Parks or Monterey County Parks Department. An agreement with a nonprofit organization could be developed in order to provide for management of these sites at little or no cost to the public agency.

This alternative includes an option for the Javelin Court area, including 41 housing units, to be transferred to California State Parks to be operated as rental housing. The revenue from managing the housing area could be used to partially offset operating costs of the Milpitas Hacienda complex and the ranch bungalows.



The Milpitas Hacienda, Richard Crusius photo

## Environmental Impact Topics

### MANDATORY TOPICS

National Park Service policies require that several impact topics be considered and either be addressed in the environmental assessment, or else be explicitly determined to be irrelevant. Environmental impact topics were selected for analysis based on federal laws, regulations, and NPS Management Policies; concerns expressed by the public or other agencies during scoping; and the relevance to the study and to the alternatives under consideration. Because the *Draft Fort Hunter Liggett Special Resource Study* addresses a small number of structures on sites that have already been developed or disturbed, and no major development proposals are recommended as part of the alternatives, several topics were dismissed from further analysis.

These topics requiring mandatory consideration are:

- **Conflicts with land use plans, controls, or policies** - Dismissed. Military bases are included in the Public/Quasi-Public land use category in the Monterey County General Plan (Monterey County 2004). As federal land, Fort Hunter Liggett is not subject to local zoning.
- **Energy requirements and conservation potential** - Dismissed. This topic was dismissed from further consideration because no actions proposed involve direct energy requirements. Traffic and transportation issues are addressed in the Traffic and Circulation and Air Quality topics.
- **Natural or depletable resource requirements and conservation potential** - Dismissed. There are no natural or depletable resources associated with the BRAC excess properties.
- **Urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and design of the built environment.** This mandatory topic is addressed under the “Cultural Resources” and “Visual Resources” sections of this chapter. The “Cultural Resources” section of this chapter addresses impacts on archeological



resources, historic sites and structures, sacred sites, and the effects of existing and proposed conservation measures. The Visual Resources section address impacts on views of the surrounding landscape.

- **Socially or economically disadvantaged populations** – Dismissed. Socially or economically disadvantaged populations will not be impacted by the transfer of properties between agencies. Future use of these resources will not impact any socially or economically disadvantaged populations.
- **Wetlands and floodplains** – Dismissed. There are no wetlands on or adjacent to any of the BRAC excess properties.
- **Prime and unique agricultural lands** – Dismissed. There are no prime and unique agricultural lands associated with the BRAC excess properties.
- **Endangered and threatened plants and animals and their habitats** – Dismissed. There are no endangered or threatened plants located on the BRAC excess properties. No proposals for disturbing adjacent resources are included in the alternatives considered.
- **Important scientific, archeological, and other cultural resources, including properties listed or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.** The “Cultural Resources” section of this chapter addresses impacts on historic properties and archeological resources listed or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.
- **Ecologically critical areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, or other unique natural resources** – Dismissed. There are no ecologically critical areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, or other natural features associated with these properties.
- **Public health and safety.** The Hazardous and Toxic Materials; Public Health and Safety; Air Quality; Noise; and Traffic and Circulation sections address impacts that may affect public health and safety.

- **Sacred sites.** Addressed in the “Cultural Resources” section of this chapter.
- **Indian Trust resources** – Dismissed. This topic was dismissed from further consideration because there are no Indian Trust Resources within the study area.

Additional relevant impact topics included in this analysis are:

- **Public Use and Enjoyment:** Impacts on public use and enjoyment of the historic properties proposed for transfer to other agencies.
- **Regional Economy:** Impacts related to population, housing and employment.

## Environmental Consequences of Alternative A: No-Action

Under this alternative, the Army would retain the BRAC excess property until transfer to another agency occurs. During this interim period the Army is not authorized to expend funds on the BRAC excess property. The interim use period has been in effect for the BRAC excess property since July 2001, when the Army's authority to spend funds on these areas expired. Because the day to day costs of operating the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows are covered by leasing arrangements, these structures have remained in use during this interim period. Structures without interim funding sources are not in use (e.g. Gil Adobe). It is not known how long the interim period will continue before the properties are transferred to another agency.

For future property disposal, the Army would eventually pursue one of the options outlined in the Army's *Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett* or would take other action, at their discretion. The Army environmental assessment includes two options that do not involve the National Park Service: a no-action option and an encumbered disposal option. Because it is unknown when future transfer would take place or which agency or organization the properties would be transferred to, the following analysis of the no-action alternative assesses the impacts of continued Army management during the interim period. The analysis assumes that under the No - Action Alternative, with the exception of the Milpitas Hacienda, management of the historic properties for public use would not occur due to constraints in financing for maintenance and operation. The impacts of transfer and management of the BRAC property for public use are analyzed under Alternative B.

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

**Historic structures.** During the interim use period, the Milpitas Hacienda would continue to be under lease and concession arrangements for

lodging and food service. The ability of the Army to maintain the Milpitas Hacienda would be limited by policies which prohibit expenditures of funds on excess property. The concessioner would be responsible for maintenance that is essential to the current use and operation of the Milpitas Hacienda. Recommendations made in the Historic Preservation Plan to lessen the visual intrusions on the historic fabric and to protect the architectural integrity through enhancement would not be implemented. The Army would continue to lease out the ranch bungalows for housing. The Gil Adobe would continue to remain boarded up. No major investment would be made towards its stabilization or restoration.

If the interim period continues for an extended length of time, there would be no funding available for major repair or rehabilitation of the structures. This would result in indirect minor to major adverse impacts on the historic structures. Intensity of the impacts would depend on the nature of the damage (e.g. damage from natural disasters or fire versus day-to-day wear).

No direct impacts on the structures are anticipated assuming that there would be no modification or demolition of historic properties. However, deterioration of historic properties from lessened maintenance-levels during interim use could result in long-term indirect adverse effects to the integrity of the structures. Limited protection of the historic setting could result in minor to moderate adverse impacts on the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows. Adverse indirect impacts on the Gil Adobe from continued deterioration could be minor to major depending on the length of time that the structure remains boarded up. Given the controlled access at Fort Hunter Liggett it is unlikely that vandalism or overuse would have an impact on resources. Public education and interpretation of cultural resources would continue to be minimal resulting in an inability to expand the public's awareness of the historical significance of the historic properties.

**Archeological resources.** No direct environmental effects on archeological resources at the Tidball Store land, the Gil Adobe and Milpitas Hacienda would be expected under interim use period because there would be no ground-disturbing activities on the properties. Fort Hunter Liggett would continue to consult with their cultural resource management staff to avoid or mitigate impacts during training activities.

### **VISUAL RESOURCES**

Declining maintenance during the interim use period could have adverse impacts on the appearance of buildings and grounds. For example, fencing was recently installed along Hacienda Hill for security purposes. Minor to moderate adverse effects on the visual quality of the immediate setting of the historic properties could be expected during the interim use period.

During the interim use period, the Gil Adobe would remain boarded and draped with tarps. Further deterioration could result in additional adverse impacts on the surrounding visual resources. Such impacts could be minor to moderate depending on the length of time the structure remains unstabilized and in interim status. No impacts are expected for the Tidball Store land, although if the county-owned structure continues to be unused, impacts on the appearance may result from the lack of maintenance. Continued use of Javelin Court for housing would not impact visual resources at Fort Hunter Liggett.

### **PUBLIC USE AND ENJOYMENT**

Under interim use status, public use and enjoyment of the excess properties would be limited to the Milpitas Hacienda. Without additional visitor programs or services, visitation would remain at levels similar to current use. If interim use continues for an extended period of time, minor to moderate adverse impacts on public use and enjoyment would be expected due to lack of funding for repair or rehabilitation.

### **TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION**

Changes in traffic and circulation on Fort Hunter Liggett are not expected under interim use. No direct or indirect effects on traffic and circulation are anticipated.

### **AIR QUALITY**

Air emissions associated with the BRAC excess property are expected to remain the same during interim use. No direct or indirect impacts on air quality are anticipated.

### **NOISE**

Noise levels at the BRAC excess property are not expected to change during interim use. No direct or indirect effects on noise are anticipated.

### **HAZARDOUS AND TOXIC MATERIALS**

Removal and remediation of asbestos and lead-based paint found in the Milpitas Hacienda, the historic ranch buildings, and the Gil Adobe would not take place. No direct or indirect impacts would be expected (US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District 2000b).

### **PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY**

**Public Utilities.** Access to public utilities would remain the same under interim use status.

### **Fire, Law Enforcement and Emergency**

**Medical Services.** Interim use status would have no direct effects on public services. The Fort Hunter Liggett fire station and police station would continue to respond to emergencies at the BRAC excess property (US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District 2000b).



Nacimiento River, NPS photo

## REGIONAL ECONOMY

The number of employees at Fort Hunter Liggett not be affected by the interim use status. Services provided at the Milpitas Hacienda (restaurant, bar, overnight lodging) would continue during this time. The Javelin Court housing area would continue to house Fort Hunter Liggett employees at 95% occupancy. No direct effects on the regional economy are expected during interim use.

## CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Adverse cumulative impacts on the historic structures may occur over time. Impacts from the vibrations of tank maneuvers and low-flying aircrafts could over time have a minor to major adverse impact on the physical integrity of the historic structures. Deferred maintenance due to lack of funding for major repairs and rehabilitation would result in further deterioration of the historic structures over time.

## Environmental Consequences of Alternative B: An Addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and Designation as an Affiliated Area of the National Park System

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

**Historic Structures:** The transfer, lease, or sale of historic property out of Federal ownership without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions is generally considered to have an adverse effect on that property (36 CFR 800.5 [a] [2] [vii]). Under this alternative, preservation covenants and protective easements would be included in the real estate documents to mitigate such adverse effects.

As a new component of Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and an affiliated area of the National Park Service, new resources would be available to protect the architectural integrity of the Milpitas Hacienda and to address the visual intrusions on the historic ranch fabric. California State Park professionals with historic preservation expertise would be charged with ensuring the long-term protection of the resource.

Interpretation and education of the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows in the context of the historic ranch and the San Simeon estate would be a significant part of California State Parks management and operations, creating greater public awareness of the historical importance of these resources.

Under Alternative B, the Milpitas Hacienda would also be considered for addition to the San Simeon Estate National Historic Landmark. As a contributing component to the national historic landmark, the Milpitas Hacienda would receive additional recognition and would be managed under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation. Management of the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows by California State Parks, national recognition of the Milpitas Hacienda and technical assistance from the National Park Service would create major

direct beneficial impacts on the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows in the long term.

Alternative B includes the potential for collaboration with the Monterey Diocese to assist in the curation of artifacts and the management of visitors to the Mission San Antonio de Padua. Such collaboration would have minor to major long term beneficial impacts on structures and artifacts at the Mission San Antonio de Padua.

Transfer of the Gil Adobe to a local agency and management through a non-profit entity for historic preservation would have direct beneficial long term impacts. Coordinated management and interpretation of the Jolon town site would greatly increase public awareness of Jolon's role in Monterey County history and would have a long-term beneficial impact on historic properties not included in this study such as the Tidball Store structure, the Dutton Hotel ruin, and St. Luke's Episcopal Church.

Increased visitor contact with historic structures could potentially result in damage through normal wear- and- tear and through vandalism. Impacts could be mitigated through visitor management programs, and regular maintenance by park personnel. Increased education and interpretation could reduce damage and vandalism through increasing appreciation and awareness of the resources.

**Archeological Resources.** Modifications to the landscape surrounding the structures to accommodate increased public access could result in direct adverse impacts on archeological resources. The level of impacts would depend on the location and siting of facilities for public access or new building uses. As with the historic structures, the potential for vandalism might increase. However, these impacts would likely be mitigated through visitor management. Additional research and documentation of archeological resources at the BRAC excess properties would have a long term indirect beneficial impact.

## VISUAL RESOURCES

Under this alternative, minor disturbance in the vicinity of the transferred structures may occur to accommodate facilities for better public access. It is assumed that such modifications would be designed to avoid impacts on the historic setting. The structures' exteriors would be adequately preserved.

Management of the Milpitas Hacienda and ranch bungalows by California State Parks would emphasize preservation of the historic setting and surrounding visual quality. California State Parks, with technical assistance from the National Park Service, could work to remove current impacts on the visual quality of historic setting. Because this could only apply to the BRAC excess properties that are transferred, this action would have a minor to moderate beneficial impact.

Under this alternative, the Gil Adobe could be stabilized or restored by a non-profit organization and managed as part of a larger



Above: Dutton Hotel (Jolon area), circa 1935, San Antonio Valley Historical Society photo; Below: Dutton Hotel, 2004, NPS photo



effort to interpret and preserve the Jolon town site including the Tidball Store and the one -acre of land that will be transferred. This would have a minor to moderate long - term beneficial impact on visual resources of the Jolon area.

### **PUBLIC USE AND ENJOYMENT**

Addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and designation as an affiliated area of the national park system would provide greater opportunities for public use and enjoyment at Fort Hunter Liggett. California State Parks, with technical assistance from the National Park Service, would create additional opportunities to interpret the history of the Milpitas Hacienda in association with William Randolph Hearst's historic estate and architect Julia Morgan. Public use and enjoyment would be increased by exhibits, displays, and personal communication.

The Mission San Antonio de Padua has expressed interest in working with California State Parks and the National Park Service to manage visitors to the Mission and to assist in artifact curation. Interpretation of the Mission San Antonio de Padua could enhance the experience of visitors to the Milpitas Hacienda. California State Parks may also find it possible to undertake some interpretation of other aspects of Fort Hunter Liggett, including both its military history and its significant natural history.

With a California State Park presence and National Park Service affiliated area designation, annual visitation could increase by 10,000 visitors per year to the cantonment area per year. This projection is derived from baseline figures on overnight lodging and food service and beverages at the Milpitas Hacienda, visits to the Mission, and analysis of visitation of similarly situated NPS units. In ten or more years, once visitor programs in connection with Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument (Hearst Castle) are established, visitation could reach 50,000–75,000 as the Milpitas Hacienda provides an interpretive experience not currently available at the Hearst Castle. Visitors at the Milpitas Hacienda can spend the night and dine in a building used by

William Randolph Hearst and designed by Julia Morgan.

Currently, only visitors who can afford to stay overnight at the Milpitas Hacienda have an opportunity to enjoy the building interiors aside from the lounge and the restaurant. With additional interpretive programs provided by California State Parks, there may be lower cost day use opportunities for lower-income populations to learn about the history of the Milpitas Hacienda and other history aspects of Fort Hunter Liggett.

Under this alternative, it is assumed that the historic properties at Jolon would be managed by a local agency or non - profit entity. Visitor interpretation, which is currently limited to two plaques, would be improved and if feasible, the Gil Adobe could be restored for public use and interpretation. Public amenities located off of Jolon Road at the Tidball Store could attract visitors from the Milpitas Hacienda, and visitors from the rapidly growing Salinas Valley wine industry. In addition, the recent opening of the National Steinbeck Center in Salinas may attract visitors to Jolon. Jolon in the Gold Rush era was featured as the setting in one of Steinbeck's novels. Overall, Alternative B would provide for moderate direct beneficial impacts on public use and enjoyment opportunities in Monterey County.

### **TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION**

Approximately 10,000 additional visitors (an estimated 3,500 vehicles, based on 2.8 persons per vehicle) would be expected to be attracted to the installation annually in the near term. With future development of the Jolon Road "wine corridor" and increased marketing and visitor programs by California State Parks, vehicle numbers would increase. Because a portion of future visitors would be expected to arrive in buses, vehicle numbers may be considerably lower than the 2.8 persons per vehicle estimate for 50,000 to 75,000 visitors (8,000–26,000 vehicles annually). Additional cars and buses have the potential to contribute to traffic and circulation on the installation and on local roads. However, when this annual volume of

recreational traffic is compared to the daily volume of 2,720 vehicles on Mission Creek Road (nearly 1 million vehicles annually) it becomes apparent that visitors will constitute a minor increment to the overall daily traffic volume (US Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

To a large extent, recreational visitation associated with this alternative would be expected to occur more on weekend days, at a time when traffic associated with installation operations would be at a relatively low level. Consequently, even if operations and related traffic at Fort Hunter Liggett were to increase, direct adverse impacts on traffic and circulation would be minor.

It is assumed that Javelin Court will continue to function as housing and operate at the current occupancy rate of 95%. Rental units on the open market could attract residents who work outside the installation. Given that there is a demand for housing by employees at Fort Hunter Liggett, this change in tenancy would provide for negligible to minor impacts on traffic and circulation.



Nacimiento-Fergusson Road towards the coast, NPS photo

## **AIR QUALITY**

Air quality concerns in the area include both inhalable particulates and pollutants associated with combustion, including ozone. The additional visitation expected at the site should not affect inhalable particulates, since access roads to the areas of historical interest are paved and visitors would not be expected to generate dust.

However, air quality could be affected by vehicle emissions from the additional visitors attracted to the historic structures. Initially, the estimated increase of an additional 3,500 vehicles annually would constitute a minor increment to the base's operational traffic, contributing negligible increments of hydrocarbon pollutants. Increased visitation over time could cause additional adverse effects on air quality. It is noted that much of the visitor traffic would occur on weekends, at a time when commuter traffic is light and there is less likelihood of approaching or exceeding threshold pollution levels. Visitors may also arrive via buses which would reduce the amount of air pollution associated with additional vehicles.

Public transportation is currently not available to Fort Hunter Liggett. The remote location of Fort Hunter Liggett would require most visitors to travel long distances via automobile (over twenty-five miles) to access the historic structures. This could have a minor adverse effect on regional air quality. Overall, Alternative B would have minor adverse impacts on air quality.

It is assumed that Javelin Court will continue to function as housing and operate at the current occupancy rate of 95%. Rental units on the open market could attract residents who work outside the installation. Given that there is a demand for housing by employees at Fort Hunter Liggett, this change in tenancy would likely contribute to negligible to minor impacts on air quality.

## **NOISE**

Management of the historic properties for visitor use would generate additional noise as more cars and buses would be traversing through Fort Hunter Liggett. This increase in noise would cause direct effects on ambient noise. Such impacts would be negligible to minor relative to the noise levels currently generated by training activities.

## **HAZARDOUS AND TOXIC MATERIALS**

As in Alternative A, no direct or indirect impacts on public health and safety would be expected. The results of any previous asbestos investigations and surveys would be provided to California State

Parks. Army regulations do not require that asbestos-containing material be remediated in buildings prior to transfer. However, the Army is required to abate any asbestos-containing material that does not comply with applicable laws, regulations or standards or that poses a threat to human health.

According to the Army's *Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett*, lead in soils would be investigated with other potentially contaminated sites. Some residential units have been inspected for lead-based paint and lead-based paint hazards. Inspection and survey results and descriptions of abatement measures taken would be provided by the Army to California State Parks. Consistent with the Residential Lead-based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-550), the Army would provide notice in transfer documents that buildings containing lead-based paint would be restricted from residential use unless the recipient of the property abates any hazards.

Lead paint removal or remediation has the potential to slow development of the property for public use. This could have a moderate impact on future reuse of the property. In the long term, funding may be available for lead paint or asbestos abatement, particularly if restoration work were to commence. Such abatement action would have a minor to moderate beneficial impact.

## PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

**Public Utilities.** Increased visitation to the historic properties would create increased demand on public utilities. The initial increase in visitors could be up to 10,000 annually and could possibly reach up to 50,000 to 75,000 in the long term as California State Parks incorporates the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows into its operation at Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument. Assuming that annual visitation eventually reaches 75,000 (primarily day-use), consumptive demands on the water system would amount to less than an acre-foot per year, constituting a minor increment to water use on the installation, which is generally between 300 and

350 acre-feet per year. This minor increment of water demand would not result in overdraft of the aquifer which supplies water for the installation.

There are no new development projects or new land uses associated with this alternative that would result in an increase in discharge of either sediment or chemical/biological pollutants to either surface water bodies or to groundwater. According to design capacities documented in the Army's *Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett*, wastewater would be adequately treated by the existing plant, which operates with a substantial surplus capacity. Electrical and propane systems would similarly have more than enough surplus capacity to accommodate short and long-term increases in visitation. As in Alternative A, the occupancy rates at Javelin Court would likely stay the same (95%) and would not impact existing utility systems. Overall, adverse impacts on public utilities would be negligible.

**Fire, Law Enforcement and Emergency Medical Services.** Increased visitation and use of the historic properties may result in impacts on public services. Transfer to a state agency could result in increased response times if public services are provided by agencies and hospitals in King City. These impacts would be mitigated by the establishment of a mutual assistance agreement between the receiving agencies and the Army. California State Parks would enter into an agreement with the Fort Hunter Liggett fire station and police station to respond emergencies at the excess properties (US Army Corps of Engineers, 2000b). This service would be on per call basis for initial response. California State Parks could contract with the Monterey County Sheriff's office to conduct follow-up investigations to police incidents. In the long term, California State Parks may have its own law enforcement presence at Fort Hunter Liggett as the potential to develop a training facility for California State Parks law enforcement facilities at Fort Hunter Liggett is under discussion. Local agencies or non-profit entities managing the Jolon area properties would likely enter into a mutual

assistance agreement to provide emergency services for visitors. If arrangements are made with Fort Hunter Liggett to provide initial emergency response services, impacts to response times at the Milpitas Hacienda and the Jolon area would be negligible.

## **REGIONAL ECONOMY**

This alternative would increase the number of recreational visitors to Fort Hunter Liggett by approximately 10,000 visitors per year, with the potential to reach 50,000 to 75,000 in the long term. These visitors would contribute to the local economy by purchasing various goods and services, including food, gasoline, and lodging. To the extent that such expenditures are recycled in the local economy, a multiplier effect would occur. The Javelin Court housing area would continue to function as housing and operate at the current occupancy rate of 95%. Contributions to the local economy by residents at the Javelin Court housing area would not change under this alternative. Overall, minor to moderate, direct and indirect beneficial impacts on the local economy would be expected.

## **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY**

As discussed above, the additional recreational traffic stimulated by creation of a unit of the California State Park System would contribute to air pollution in the area, although it is expected to be a minor contributor. The remote location of Fort Hunter Liggett would require most visitors to travel long distances via automobile (over twenty-five miles) to access the historic structures. Over time, increased visitation by automobile may contribute minor cumulative impacts on the regional air quality.

Alternative B would result in long term enhanced resource protection and preservation of the historic properties. Cumulative impacts from increased visitation over time could result in some amount of deterioration of historic structures or disturbance to archeological resources.

Management of the properties with historic preservation and cultural resource protection as a main objective would ensure that these impacts

are prevented to the greatest degree possible. Additional resources for cultural resource management would contribute towards the maintenance and upkeep of the historic structures and would mitigate against visitor impacts.



Table 16: Summary of Environmental Consequences.

Topics	Alternative A	Alternative B
<p><b>Cultural Resources</b></p> <p>Mandatory Topics:</p> <p><i>Urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and design of the built environment</i></p> <p><i>Important scientific, archeological or other cultural resources, including properties listed or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.</i></p> <p><i>Sacred sites</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Deterioration of historic properties from lessened maintenance during interim use status could result in indirect, minor to moderate adverse impacts on historic structures.</li> <li>■ If the interim period continues for an extended length of time, there would be no funding available for major repair or rehabilitation of the structures. This would result in direct minor to major adverse impacts on the historic structures. Intensity of the impacts would depend on the nature of the damage (e.g. damage from natural disasters or fire versus day to day wear).</li> <li>■ No direct impacts to archeological resources during interim use status would be expected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Management of the Milpitas Hacienda and ranch bungalows by California State Parks, national recognition of the Milpitas Hacienda, and technical assistance from the National Park Service would create major beneficial impacts to the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows in the long-term.</li> <li>■ Collaboration with the Monterey Diocese to assist in the curation of artifacts and the management of visitors to the Mission San Antonio de Padua would have minor to major long term beneficial impacts on cultural resources at the Mission.</li> <li>■ Transfer of the Gil Adobe to a local agency and management through a non-profit entity for historic preservation would have direct beneficial impacts.</li> <li>■ Coordinated management and interpretation of the Jolon town site would have a long-term beneficial impact on nearby historic properties not owned by the Army or included in this study (Tidball Store, Dutton Hotel, and St. Luke's Episcopal Church).</li> <li>■ Increased education, visitor management programs, regular maintenance by park personnel, and protection against vandalism would mitigate impacts on cultural resources from increased visitor use at the historic properties.</li> </ul>

Topics	Alternative A	Alternative B
<p><b>Visual Resources</b></p> <p>Mandatory Topics:</p> <p><i>Urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and design of the built environment</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor to moderate indirect adverse impacts to the setting of the historic properties could be expected from lessened maintenance under interim use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the long term, California State Parks management, with technical assistance from the National Park Service, could work to improve the visual quality of the Milpitas Hacienda and its historic setting resulting in minor to moderate beneficial impacts.</li> <li>Restoration or stabilization of the Gil Adobe and interpretation of the larger Jolon town site by a non-profit organization would have a minor to moderate long-term beneficial impact on visual resources of the Jolon area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Public Use and Enjoyment</b></p> <p>Mandatory Topics:</p> <p><i>None identified</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public use and enjoyment would remain constant under interim use status. However, if interim use continues for an extended period of time, minor to moderate adverse impacts on public use and enjoyment would be expected due to lack of funding for repair or rehabilitation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative B would provide for moderate direct beneficial impacts on public use and enjoyment opportunities at the Milpitas Hacienda, the Mission San Antonio de Padua, and the Jolon area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Traffic and Circulation</b></p> <p>Mandatory Topics:</p> <p><i>Public health and safety</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes in traffic and circulation on Fort Hunter Liggett are not expected under interim use. No direct or indirect effects on traffic and circulation are anticipated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More visitors associated with future management of the properties have the potential to contribute to traffic and circulation on the installation and on local roads. However, when compared to the daily volume of vehicles on Mission Creek Road, the new visitors would constitute a minor increment to the overall traffic volume. Direct adverse impacts would be minor.</li> <li>Javelin Court impacts on traffic and circulation would be the same as Alternative A.</li> </ul>

Topics	Alternative A	Alternative B
<b>Air Quality</b>  Mandatory Topics:  <i>Public health and safety</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Air emissions associated with the BRAC excess property are expected to remain the same during interim use. No direct or indirect impacts on air quality are anticipated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased visitation would have direct minor adverse impacts on local and regional air quality.</li> <li>Javelin Court impacts on air quality would be the same as Alternative A.</li> </ul>
<b>Noise</b>  Mandatory Topics:  <i>Public health and safety</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise levels at the BRAC excess property are not expected to change during interim use. No direct or indirect effects on noise are anticipated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on noise from increased visitation would be negligible to minor relative to the noise levels currently generated by current training activities.</li> </ul>
<b>Hazardous and Toxic Materials</b>  Mandatory Topics:  <i>Public health and safety</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal and remediation of asbestos and lead-based paint found in the Milpitas Hacienda, the historic ranch buildings, and the Gil Adobe would not take place. No direct or indirect impacts would be expected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the long term, funding may be available for lead paint or asbestos abatement, particularly if restoration work were to commence. Such abatement action would have a minor to moderate beneficial impact.</li> </ul>
<b>Public Health and Safety</b>  Mandatory Topics:  <i>Public health and safety</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No adverse impacts to public utilities or emergency services at Fort Hunter Liggett would be expected under interim use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to public utilities and emergency response services would be negligible.</li> </ul>
<b>Regional Economy</b>  Mandatory Topics:  <i>None identified</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No effects to the regional economy are expected during interim use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased visitation to the Milpitas Hacienda, the Mission San Antonio de Padua, and the Jolon area would result in direct and indirect beneficial impacts on the local economy. The intensity of effects would be minor to moderate.</li> </ul>

Topics	Alternative A	Alternative B
Cumulative Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adverse cumulative impacts on the historic structures may occur over time. Deferred maintenance due to lack of funding for major repairs and rehabilitation would result in further deterioration of the historic structures over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The remote location of Fort Hunter Liggett would require most visitors to travel long distances via automobile (over twenty-five miles) to access the historic structures. Over time, increased visitation may have minor cumulative impacts on the regional air quality.</li> <li>Cumulative impacts from increased visitation over time could result in some amount of deterioration of historic structures or disturbance to archeological resources.</li> <li>Additional resources for cultural resource management would contribute towards the maintenance and upkeep of the historic structures and would mitigate against such visitor impacts.</li> </ul>

## Conclusions

This section compares and summarizes the environmental impacts of Alternatives A and B. The comparison of impacts associated with each alternative includes an assessment of: 1) sustainability and long-term management issues required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and NPS policies and 2) the preferred alternative.

### SUSTAINABILITY AND LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT

NEPA requires consideration of the long-term impact and effect of each alternative on future options. The National Park Service applies principles of sustainability to determine the long-term impact of management options or alternatives. Sustainable development is defined as “that which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.” The discussion

of sustainability and long-term management includes conclusions on short-term environmental use versus long-term productivity, any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources, and adverse impacts that cannot be fully mitigated or avoided.

- **The relationship between local short-term uses of the environment and maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity.** During the interim period under Alternative A there could be adverse impacts on cultural resources including possible deterioration from lessened maintenance levels and limited protection of the surrounding landscape for its historic value.

Implementation of Alternative B would provide more opportunities to permanently protect and to enhance significant cultural resources through cooperative management by California State Parks and the National Park



Service. State park professionals with historic preservation expertise would ensure long-term protection of cultural resources. National recognition of the Milpitas Hacienda and technical assistance from the NPS would create direct major direct beneficial impacts to the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows in the long-term. Transfer of the Gil Adobe to California State Parks or Monterey County Parks Department and management through a non-profit entity for historic preservation would have direct beneficial and long-term impacts. This alternative would prevent the possible adverse impacts that would occur during the interim period under Alternative A.

- **Irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources that would be involved if the alternative were implemented.** Under Alternative A, cultural resources could suffer some irreversible and irretrievable impacts. The integrity of cultural resources could suffer negative impacts from deterioration. Some of the cultural resources may eventually be lost depending on the length of time the properties remain under interim use status. Alternative B would provide more opportunities to permanently protect significant cultural resources from irreversible and irretrievable impacts in the long term through management by California State Parks and technical assistance from the NPS.

- **Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.** Under Alternative A, some deterioration of historic properties would likely occur, depending on the length of the interim period. Under Alternative B, management of the cultural resources by California State Parks in cooperation with the NPS would eliminate unavoidable adverse impacts.

### PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The environmentally preferred alternative is the one that best protects, preserves and enhances historic, cultural and natural resources, and that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment. Under Alternative A, adverse cumulative impacts on cultural resources could occur over time. Lack of funding for maintenance and rehabilitation could result in cumulative impacts to the historic setting. Alternative B provides additional opportunities for long-term sustainable management and conservation of nationally significant resources. Alternative B would ensure the management and protection of historic cultural resources through assignment of the BRAC structures and features to California State Parks. Alternative B is identified as the environmentally preferred alternative.

The NPS preferred alternative is the one that would be most effective and efficient in protecting significant resources and providing for public enjoyment. Alternative B is the NPS's preferred alternative as it provides greater environmental benefit and results in effective protection of the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows through management by California State Parks. It also allows for operational efficiencies between CSP's operation of Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and the Milpitas Hacienda.



Mission San Antonio de Padua, Richard Crusius photo